

## **REMARKS**

### **1. Status of Claims**

Claims 1-16 and 18-20 were pending in the application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 7 and 9 and canceled claims 2-3, 6, and 8 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully request entry of the above amendments and consideration of the enclosed remarks. Applicants submit that no new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-5, 7, 9-16 and 18-20 will remain pending in the application.

### **2. Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)**

In section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,119,186 to Watts, et al. ("Watts '186") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0061716 A1 by Cheung, et al. ("Cheung '716").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 7 and 9 and canceled claims 2-3, 6, and 8 without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, the rejection is moot.

Applicants respectfully maintain the assertion that the combination of references is improper. For example, the Examiner states that the reason for the combination is to allow notifications to be viewed and managed by a user as desired in a clear instance of impermissible hindsight (Office Action, middle page 7). Watts '186 does not teach or suggest a list of notifications or any possibility of delayed response to such notifications. While that problem is appreciated and successfully overcome in the teachings of the present application, it is not a problem appreciated in the art. In Watts '186, the author describes a system of static, serial state change prompts (See Fig. 5B, 5C and 5D) in which the system waits for a prompt and sits in a single state loop until a response is received. Watts '186 has a home state that receives messages from sensors that can be queued, (36 in FIG. 3), but the actual system configuration change responses such as launching applications are only serially prompted and acted on. See Watts '186 at Col. 9, lines 66-67 and Col. 10, lines 22-30. One of skill in the art would not look to a system for managing a plurality of notices

such as in Cheung '716, since the system must serial wait for a response to each prompt. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination is not proper and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

With regard to claim 1, the cited references do not alone or in proper combination teach or suggest at least:

changing the environment context in response to the selection and revised application parameter data received from the user in response to the query.

In fact, neither reference teaches or fairly suggest allowing a user to modify the application parameter data in the queue. The cited reference to Watts '186 at Col. 10, lines 22-27 and Col. 9, lines 60-65 does not concern application parameters but only acceptance of the notification or external data.

Similarly, with regard to independent claim 7, the cited references do not alone or in proper combination teach or suggest at least:

“changing the environment context in response to the selection and revised application parameter data received from the user in response to the query”

The additional dependent claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons described above with regard to the respective independent claim and any intervening claims.

With regard to dependent claim 11, Watts '186 does not describe terminating processing includes terminating an application since FIG. 8, element 118 describes terminating software before the user prompt in 120.

With respect to dependent claims 13-16, Applicants respectfully disagree that Watts '186 teaches using either application parameters or new application parameters at Col. 6, lines 22-28 or Col. 12, lines 54-55 and instead only describes configurable “informants” or sensors and not application parameters to be used when launching the application such as the example of POWERPOINT.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and respectfully submit that claims 1, 4-5, 7, 9-16 and 18-20 are in condition for allowance.

**3. Conclusion Of Remarks**

For at least the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance and early and favorable action thereon is requested.

If the Examiner believes that additional issues may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicant at (203) 924-3180.

**4. Authorization**

No fee is believed due with this Communication. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the response or credit any overpayment to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-822-O1.

In the event that an extension of time or additional extension of time is required to make this response timely filed, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time that is required to make this response timely. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-822-O1.

Respectfully submitted,  
/George M. Macdonald/

---

George M. Macdonald  
Reg. No. 39,284  
Attorney of Record  
Telephone (203) 924-3180  
PITNEY BOWES INC.  
Intellectual Property and Technology Law Department  
35 Waterview Drive, P.O. Box 3000  
Shelton, CT 06484-8000